

I argue against the proposal to allow media companies to own both newspaper and television outlets in the same area.

Some competition must be preserved. Our own history shows that big companies seek to dominate markets, simply for the reason that such dominance is often profitable.

Gathering information is expensive. It takes time and effort, which might be cut short if only one profit oriented conglomerate owns a substantial number of outlets in the same area. The conflict is one of the public's need to know certain things so that it can make informed decisions about how to govern its own affairs, and who controls the information going to the public. Quite frankly, the public's right to be informed, outweighs any consideration of profit for private corporations. This proposal sacrifices an informed public for sake of profit for a select few.

What is needed is a framework that fosters competition between outlets, as between different points of view. Relaxing the requirements as this proposal would, is NOT compatible with such a framework.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

John J. Zink
jmhazink@hotmail.com